

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006***Clarified 04-14-2008****Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

The North Dakota ICC provided recommendations after reviewing data, data collection procedures, progress on established Improvement Activities, and proposed Improvement Activities. Proposed Improvement Activities were developed with input from Technical Assistance Project staff and to support Regional Quality Improvement Activities.

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments

Indicator 1: Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

Account for untimely receipt of services.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 (2006-2007)	100 % of infants and toddlers with IFSPs will receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs within 2 weeks of the start date indicated on their signed IFSP

Actual Target Data for FFY 2006:

2006 = $814/830 \times 100 = 98.07\%$ (Accounting for documented exceptional family circumstances)

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for FFY 2006:

The data for this indicator was collected for all IFSP services for all eligible infants and toddlers through Quality Enhancement Reviews completed by Case Managers (Service Coordinators). The data represents early intervention services delivered from January 1, 2007 through June 30, 2007. 98.07% represents an increase of 38.81 percentage points from 2005. The improvement is due primarily to enhanced documentation and data collection procedures.

Examples of the 14 exceptional family circumstances that prevented the timely delivery of services included children being hospitalized, children with ear infections delaying Tympanometers, and families preparing for the deployment of a parent.

None of the 16 children who did not receive all the services identified on their IFSP by the projected start date, experienced more than one service that did not begin in a timely manner. New services were initiated by the date projected on the IFSP for all children in three regions. One region had one service that was not initiated timely. Two regions had two children each who did not receive a service by the date projected. One region had three children who did not have a service initiated timely. The remaining 8

children, half of the statewide total, were in one region. Statewide, all of the early intervention services not delivered in a timely manner were transdisciplinary consultations. Consultation from Speech Language Pathologists accounted for 15 of the untimely consultations. A consultation from a Physical Therapist was the remaining service not delivered in a timely manner.

In FFY 2004/2005, 8 findings of noncompliance were issued. In FFY 2005-2006 one of those findings was closed. In FFY 2006-2007, one additional finding was issued and 3 findings were closed, resulting in 5 remaining findings of noncompliance.

During this reporting period, changes were made to the North Dakota data collection process to 1) identify early intervention services being initiated versus those being continued; 2) collect family confirmation of when services began; 3) document why services were not initiated if they did not occur by or before the date indicated on the IFSP; and 4) facilitate analysis of data.

Improvement Activities being implemented during 2006-2007 to address untimely delivery of services include: 1) purchase of equipment to facilitate distance based consultation (digital video cameras and webcams); 2) a study to examine staffing ratios and reimbursement rates; and 3) development of task specific early intervention competencies.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for FFY 2006:

The following Improvement Activities were added to validate data, address lack of timely hearing screenings and facilitate the development of Early Intervention Competencies:

3.A *02-01-2008 – Data regarding timely initiation of early intervention services will be sampled to verify accuracy of data entry and targeted Technical Assistance provided as needed to assure valid and reliable data

5.A *02-01-2008 – A group of Audiologists recommended specific equipment for local early intervention programs and agreed to provide training and read results of OAEs and Tymps. The equipment has been ordered and training will be scheduled within 30 days of equipment delivery.

5.B *02-01-2008 - Contract will be developed with Audiologists to train identified early intervention staff, review all OAE and Tymp results, and periodically reassess early intervention staff skills.

9.A *02-01-2008 – University contractors developed recommendations for competency areas and possible implementation strategies. A taskforce of early intervention professionals and families will be formed to operationalize the process and develop an implementation timeline.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:** See Indicator # 1**Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments****Indicator 2:** Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children.¹

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or programs for typically developing children) divided by the (total # of infants and toddlers with IFSPs)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 (2005-2006)	96.4% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs will primarily receive early intervention in the home or programs for typically developing children

Actual Target Data for 2006 (2006-2007):2006 = $697/757 \times 100 = 92.07\%$ **Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for** (2006):

2006 Target of 96.4% was not met. Analysis indicates the slippage of 6.19 percentage points from 2005 is due mainly to an increasing number of families in larger communities who are accessing private therapy funded by their insurance or Medicaid. North Dakota early intervention services are funded through a Title XIX Home and Community Based Services waiver. The income and assets of families are not deemed resulting in infants and toddlers who receive early intervention waivers services being Medicaid eligible without a Recipient Liability.

The direct therapy children receive in settings not routine for typically developing peers is in addition to the early intervention service delivery model of individualized transdisciplinary coaching with consultation from other disciplines. IFSPs document when a child needs direct therapy that is not integrated into their daily routines due to medical or other needs. The number of children requiring this type of support has not changed and does not account for the slippage.

¹ At the time of the release of this package, revised forms for collection of 618 State reported data had not yet been approved. Indicators will be revised as needed to align with language in the 2005-2006 State reported data collections.

Preliminary 2007 Settings Data indicates an increase to 94.32% of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who are primarily receiving early intervention supports in their home or in settings with typically developing peers.

Improvement Activities will continue to be implemented to provide information to physicians, therapists, private and public insurance funders and families regarding research that addresses how infants and toddlers acquire developmental skills through routine based learning opportunities. The ASSIST data system will be modified to capture IFSP team recommendations regarding other services the family may choose to access. The data changes will facilitate more in depth analysis of settings and frequency.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for (2006)

The following Improvement Activities were added:

4.A *02-01-08 – Refine and distribute Natural Environment Policy statement based on material developed by Natural Environment Community of Practice.

5.A *02-01-08 – Design and deliver training regarding Child Protective Services reporting requirements and procedures for Case Management, Infant Development and Right Track staff.

10. *02-01-08 – Modify ASSIST data system to capture IFSP Team recommendations regarding other services the family chooses to access.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for _____ (Insert FFY)**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**See Indicator # 1, **Progress data recorded on SPP Template****Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments****Indicator 3:** Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved:

- A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships);
- B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/ communication); and
- C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Measurement:

A. Positive social-emotional skills (including social relationships):

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

B. Acquisition and use of knowledge and skills (including early language/communication and early literacy):

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = $[(\# \text{ of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers}) \div (\# \text{ of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed})] \times 100$.
- c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged

peers but did not reach it = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

- d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

C. Use of appropriate behaviors to meet their needs:

- a. Percent of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning = [(# of infants and toddlers who did not improve functioning) divided by (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- b. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning but not sufficient to move nearer to functioning comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- c. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to a level nearer to same-aged peers but did not reach it) divided by the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- d. Percent of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who improved functioning to reach a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.
- e. Percent of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers = [(# of infants and toddlers who maintained functioning at a level comparable to same-aged peers) divided by the (# of infants and toddlers with IFSPs assessed)] times 100.

If a + b + c + d + e does not sum to 100%, explain the difference.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
(Insert FFY)	(Insert Measurable and Rigorous Target.)

Actual Target Data for (Insert FFY):

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for (Insert FFY):

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for (Insert FFY)
[If applicable]

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

See Indicator # 1

Monitoring Priority: Early Intervention Services In Natural Environments**Indicator 4:** Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family:

- A. Know their rights;
- B. Effectively communicate their children's needs; and
- C. Help their children develop and learn.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(A) and 1442)

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family know their rights) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family effectively communicate their children's needs) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of respondent families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family help their children develop and learn) divided by the (# of respondent families participating in Part C)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 (2006-2007)	<p>A. 85 percent of families participating in Part C will report that early intervention services have helped their family know their rights.</p> <p>B. 89 percent of families participating in Part C will report that early intervention services have helped their family effectively communicate their children's needs.</p> <p>C. 87 percent of families participating in Part C will report that early intervention services have helped their family help their children develop and learn.</p>

Actual Target Data for (2006):

2006 = A = 309/363 = 85.12%
 B = 322/364 = 88.46%
 C = 314/366 = 85.79%

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for (2006):

2006 data is not statistically different from 2005 data and 2006 Targets.

	FFY 2005 Data	FFY 2006 Data	FFY 2006 Target
A. Know their rights	84.51%	85.12%	85%
B. Effectively communicate their children's needs	88.68%	88.46%	89%
C. Help their children develop and learn.	85.29%	85.79%	87%

The above data represent progress for 4A and 4C and slippage for 4B from the FFY 2005 data. The FFY 2006 target for 4A was met, but the targets for 4B and 4C were not met.

2006 data is based on responses from 366 families. This represents a response rate of 51.85%. The ECO Family Survey with a cover letter was mailed to all families receiving early intervention services during August 2006. If a response was not received following the initial mailing, a reminder postcard was sent. During June 2007, a second survey was sent to all families that had not replied to the initial survey and the families of children who had been found eligible since the first mailing. All surveys, including self addressed stamped return envelopes, were mailed from and returned to the state office. A client identification number was placed on each survey prior to mailing to allow for analysis of survey results. Only aggregate data was compiled. Client specific data was not shared with regional programs.

Initial analysis of returned surveys indicates that results are representative of families being served with the exception of American Indian families and families in the Southeast Region of the state.

		El Population Served	Returned Surveys
Age Group			
	0 to < 12 months	25.24%	16.44%
	>= 12 to < 24 months	25.94%	32.21%
	>= 24 to < 36 months	48.82%	51.34%
Gender			
	Male	62.64%	60.74%
	Female	37.36%	39.26%
Race			
	American Indian	12.02%	3.36%
	Asian or Pacific Islander	0.21%	0.00%
	Black	0.71%	0.34%
	2 or more Races	2.40%	3.02%
	White	84.65%	93.29%
Ethnicity			
	Mexican	0.93%	0.68%
	Not Hispanic or Latino	97.43%	97.28%
	Other Hispanic or Latino	1.64%	2.04%
Counts by Region			
	Northwest	4.38%	3.70%
	North Central	10.64%	12.96%
	Lake Region	8.76%	6.88%
	Northeast	13.42%	14.29%
	Southeast	20.79%	13.76%
	South Central	9.67%	10.32%
	West Central	21.28%	25.13%
	Badlands	11.06%	12.96%

A cover letter was developed to explain to families how the returned data will be used to improve services and the confidentiality of their answers. Improvement Activities were added to modify the letter to better target under represented populations, streamline data entry and allow for on-line responses.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for (2006)
[If applicable]

The following Improvement Activities were added:

2.A *02-01-08 – Modify survey cover letter, and develop and distribute brochure for families regarding use of survey data.

3. *02-01-08 - Review and refine data collection methods to assure returned surveys are representative of all families served. Develop procedures to facilitate scanning of returned surveys and mechanisms to allow families to complete the survey on-line.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

See Indicator # 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find**Indicator 5:** Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs compared to:

- A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and
- B. National data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100 compared to the same percent calculated for other States with similar (narrow, moderate or broad) eligibility definitions.
- B. Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 1)] times 100 compared to National data.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006 (2006-2007)	1.78 percent of the total population of infants and toddlers birth to 1 residing in North Dakota will be identified and found eligible for early intervention services and have an IFSP

Actual Target Data for 2006 (2006-2007):

$$2006 = 159/8,261 \times 100 = 1.92\%$$

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2005 (2005-2006):

Data for this indicator is based on 618 Child Count Reports from December 1, 2006. Data shows an increase of 0.34 percentage points from 2005 data. The 2006 Target was surpassed by 0.14 percentage points. The increase is due to continuing childfind activities not changes in eligibility criteria.

Compared to other states with narrow eligibility criteria North Dakota ranks 1st in the percent of infants and toddlers served, birth to 1.

North Dakota ranks 4th when compared to all states (excluding infants at risk) and the percent served is .88 higher than the percent served nationwide.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2005 (2005-2006):

The Improvement Activity to increase referrals from Tribal Social Service agencies was modified and an Improvement Activity added to require potential Right Track providers to identify training they will provide for professionals who conduct screenings, screening tools they will utilize, material that will be distributed to families and follow-up procedures for First Sound (Early Hearing Detection and Intervention) referrals.

*02-01-08 – Modified – Develop and offer training for Tribal Social Service Agencies regarding infant and toddler developmental risk factors, supports available and referral process for early intervention services.

*02-01-08 – Modify Right Track Request For Proposal to include plan for training screeners, screening tools to be used, material distributed to families, and First Sound Follow-up

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006 :**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:****See Indicator # 1****Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find****Indicator 6:** Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs compared to:

- A. Other States with similar eligibility definitions; and
- B. National data.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100 compared to the same percent calculated for other States with similar (narrow, moderate or broad) eligibility definitions.
- B. Percent = [(# of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs) divided by the (population of infants and toddlers birth to 3)] times 100 compared to National data.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006	2.98 percent of the total population of infants and toddlers birth to 3 residing in North Dakota

Actual Target Data for 2006:

$$2006 = 757/24,311 \times 100 = 3.11\%$$

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2006

Data for this indicator is based on 618 Child Count Reports from December 1, 2006. Data shows an increase of 0.09 percentage points from 2005 data. The 2006 Target was surpassed by 0.13 percentage points. The increase is due to continuing childfind activities not changes in eligibility criteria.

Compared to other states with narrow eligibility criteria (excluding infants at risk) North Dakota ranks 2nd in the percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 years of age served.

When compared to all states (excluding infants and toddlers at-risk), North Dakota ranks 11th in the nation and the percent served is .68 higher than the percent served nationwide.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2006:

The Improvement Activity to increase referrals from Tribal Social Service agencies was modified and an Improvement Activity added to require potential Right Track providers to identify training they will provide for professionals who conduct screenings, screening tools they will utilize, and material that will be distributed to families.

4. *02-01-08 – Modified – Develop and offer training for Tribal Social Service Agencies regarding infant and toddler developmental risk factors, supports available and referral process for early intervention services.

8. *02-01-08 – Modify Right Track Request For Proposal to include plan for training screeners, screening tools to be used, and material distributed to families

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006:**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:** See Indicator # 1**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Child Find**

Indicator 7: Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent = [(# of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting was conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline) divided by the (# of eligible infants and toddlers evaluated and assessed)] times 100.

Account for untimely evaluations.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006	100 percent of eligible infants and toddlers will have evaluations, assessments and an initial IFSP meeting conducted within 45 days of referral.

Actual Target Data for 2006

$31/32 \times 100 = 96.87\%$

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2006:

Data for this indicator was collected through the Case Review Tool based on a random sample of IFSPs in place on June 30, 2007. 32 of the sampled cases were initial IFSPs.

Six children did not have an IFSP within 45 days. Accounting for documented exceptional family circumstances only one child did not have an IFSP within 45 days. That child's IFSP was developed on day 51. Evaluations were delayed due to holidays (referred 12/06/06 with IFSP 01/25/07).

32 of the 32 (100%) of the initial IFSPs were based on multidisciplinary evaluations. 18 of the 32 evaluations (56.25%) addressed all domain areas. The 14 remaining evaluations addressed all domains except hearing. **Findings remain open for 4 programs.** All evaluations would have addressed all domains if mechanisms had been available for local Infant Development programs to conduct hearing screenings. Representatives of the North Dakota Audiology Academy have now recommended equipment and agreed to provide training and read the results of all Otoacoustical Emission and tympanometry screenings conducted by Infant Development staff. The equipment has been ordered and training will be

scheduled which will allow Infant Development program staff to complete evaluations that address all domain areas prior to the development of the initial IFSP. Protocol will also be finalized which addresses follow-up screenings for all infants and toddlers receiving early intervention services.

Review of Related Requirements attached to Indicator # 7 resulted in 160 new findings during FFY 2007/2007. 42 of those findings were closed prior to June 30, 2007. 118 Related Requirement findings remain open.

To allow for more timely correction of individual child noncompliance findings and the delivery of targeted technical assistance to address systemic noncompliance, the frequency of the ND Monitoring system is being changed from quarterly to semi annually. The process will continue to involve local teams and reviewers from the state level Technical Assistance Project as well as the standardized Case Review Tool. The new process will allow for individualized technical assistance between monitoring cycles and for correction of child specific noncompliance. On April 1, 2008 half of the programs (4 regions) will receive a list of cases that the state office has randomly selected for review. A local team consisting of at least one parent, early interventionist and Case Manager will review each case using the web based case review tool. Staff from the Technical Assistance Project will do the same type of review on different randomly selected cases from each region and also a sample of some cases the local team reviewed to assure consistency and accuracy in utilization of the Case Review Tool. The data will then be compiled and shared with each region. Areas of non-compliance will then be issued as written findings. The regions will also be notified of child specific cases of noncompliance that need to be corrected during the next quarter. Based on the areas of non-compliance, regional plans for targeted technical assistance to be delivered during the next quarter will be developed. The four remaining regions will begin to same cycle on July 1, 2008.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2006 :

The following Improvement Activities were added to address areas of noncompliance:

9.A *02-01-2008 – A group of Audiologists recommended specific equipment for local early intervention programs and agreed to provide training and read results of OAEs and Tymps. The equipment has been ordered and training will be scheduled within 30 days of equipment delivery

9.B *02-01-2008 - Contract will be developed with Audiologists to train identified early intervention staff, review all OAE and Tymps results, and periodically reassess early intervention staff skills.

10. *02-01-08 Develop and deliver ongoing monthly distance based training on topics such as Early Literacy, Brain Development, Autism, Child Development, Prematurity.

12. *02-01-08 Design and implement statewide changes in frequency of regional monitoring

13. *02-01-08 Design and implement Early Intervention Orientation based on competencies requirements

14. *02-01-08 Design and deliver training based on new Part C Regulations

15. *02-01-08 Obtain means of delivering training in settings outside of Regional Human Service Centers with capacity to record sessions and provide training to early intervention staff on the utilization of the system

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:** See Indicator # 1**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / Effective Transition****Indicator 8:** Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including:

- A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;
- B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B; and
- C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

- A. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C who have an IFSP with transition steps and services) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C)] times 100.
- B. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where notification to the LEA occurred) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.
- C. Percent = [(# of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B where the transition conference occurred) divided by the (# of children exiting Part C who were potentially eligible for Part B)] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006	<p>A. 100 percent of children exiting Part C will have an IFSP with transition steps and services.</p> <p>B. The appropriate LEA will be notified for 100 percent of the children exiting Part C who are potentially eligible for Part B.</p> <p>C. 100 percent of children exiting Part C and potentially eligible for Part B will have a transition conference 90 days before their 3rd birthday</p>

Actual Target Data for 2006:

$$A = 27/27 \times 100 = 100\%$$

$$B = 48/48 \times 100 = 100\%$$

$$C = 27/27 \times 100 = 100\% \text{ (Accounting for 4 exceptional family circumstances)}$$

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2006

Data for this indicator was collected through the Case Review Tool monitoring process. Since Transition Guidelines were developed and training conducted data regarding the transition process has improved and **all** noncompliance **previously identified** has been corrected. 618 Exiting data is indicating a slight increase in the number of children not eligible for Part B services at age 3. Data sharing with Part B will be conducted to determine if this is a trend and to analyze any possible causes.

Review of Related Requirements attached to Indicator # 8 resulted in 29 new findings during FFY 2007/2007. 5 of those findings were closed prior to June 30, 2007. 24 Related Requirement findings remain open.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for 2006 *[If applicable]*

The following Improvement Activities were modified:

4. Collect and analyze Family Transition Survey results. Modify Transition process if indicated.*02-01-08 - Family Liaison Project not started by 07-01-07 as a contractor was not located. A contract is now being developed and the timeline has been extended to 07-01-08.
6. Modify ASSIST data fields and electronic file to allow for documentation of Transition Meeting, LEA Notification and creation of an edit to prompt users to record outcome category.*02-01-08 – Due to a Code Freeze that prevented roll-out of database changes, timeline is extended to 07-01-08.

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006:**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:** See Indicator # 1**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision**

Indicator 9: General supervision system (including monitoring, complaints, hearings, etc.) identifies and corrects noncompliance as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement:

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification:

- a. # of findings of noncompliance.
- b. # of corrections completed as soon as possible but in no case later than one year from identification.

Percent = [(b) divided by (a)] times 100.

For any noncompliance not corrected within one year of identification, describe what actions, including technical assistance and/or enforcement that the State has taken.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006	100 percent of all findings of non-compliance will be corrected as soon as possible but in no case later than 1 year from identification.

Actual Target Data for 2006:

See table below

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2006:

The following table addresses non-compliance findings issued to regional early intervention programs from July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006.

Indicator	General Supervision System Components	# of Programs Monitored in FFY 2005	a. # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 (7/1/05-6/30/06)	b. # Findings from a. for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
1. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.	Monitoring: (Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review/Desk Audit/ On-Site Visit, etc.)	8	0	0
	Dispute Resolution (Complaints, due process hearings)		0	0
2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Monitoring: (Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review/Desk Audit/ On-Site Visit, etc.)	8	0	0
	Dispute Resolution (Complaints, due process hearings)		0	0
3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved outcomes	Monitoring: (Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review/Desk Audit/ On-Site Visit, etc.)	8	0	0
	Dispute Resolution (Complaints, due process hearings)		0	0

Indicator	General Supervision System Components	# of Programs Monitored in FFY 2005	a. # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 (7/1/05-6/30/06)	b. # Findings from a. for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family	Monitoring: (Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review/Desk Audit/ On-Site Visit, etc.)	8	0	0
	Dispute Resolution (Complaints, hearings)		0	0
5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Monitoring: (Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review/Desk Audit/ On-Site Visit, etc.)	8	0	0
6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs	Dispute Resolution (Complaints, hearings)		0	0
7. Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.	Monitoring: (Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review/Desk Audit/ On-Site Visit, etc.)	8	6 0	4 0
	Dispute Resolution (Complaints, hearings)		0	0
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;	Monitoring: (Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review/Desk Audit/ On-Site Visit, etc.)	8	0	0
	Dispute Resolution (Complaints, hearings)		0	0

Indicator	General Supervision System Components	# of Programs Monitored in FFY 2005	a. # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 (7/1/05-6/30/06)	b. # Findings from a. for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B	Monitoring: (Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review/Desk Audit/ On-Site Visit, etc.)	8	1	4 0
	Dispute Resolution (Complaints, hearings)		0	0
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.	Monitoring: (Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review/Desk Audit/ On-Site Visit, etc.)	8	2 0	2 0
	Dispute Resolution (Complaints, hearings)		0	0
Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b			9 1	4 0

Percent of noncompliance corrected within one year of identification = (column b sum divided by column a sum) times 100

Percent of noncompliance identified July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006 corrected by June 30, 2007 = ~~4/9~~ 0/1 x 100 = ~~44.44%~~ 0%

~~The 5 findings of noncompliance that were not corrected within one year of identification all related to Indicator # 7. Five programs continue to not address hearing in all evaluations. This is a system issue and action has been taken to order equipment and enter into contracts with audiologists that will allow Infant Development program staff to complete Otoacoustical Emission Screenings.~~

~~If data regarding hearing screenings is excluded, the Percent of noncompliance identified July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006 corrected by June 30, 2007 = 0/0 x 100 = 100%~~

~~One of the findings of noncompliance that was corrected related to Indicator # 7 (evaluations conducted by multi-disciplinary teams). Three of the findings of noncompliance that was corrected related to~~

~~Indicator # 8. One notification of LEA finding was corrected and 2 findings regarding Transition Conferences were corrected.~~

To demonstrate the details captured through the early intervention monitoring system, Indicator # 9 in North Dakota APR submitted February 1, 2007 contained data regarding findings of noncompliance made during the July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007 reporting period. Based on current OSEP guidance those findings should not be reported until the APR submission of February 1, 2008. The following table shows the progress local programs have made on correcting those finding of noncompliance.

Indicator	General Supervision System Components	# of Programs Monitored in FFY 2005	a. # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 (7/1/05-6/30/06)	b. # Findings from a. for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
1. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who receive the early intervention services on their IFSPs in a timely manner.	Monitoring: (Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review/Desk Audit/ On-Site Visit, etc.)	8	7 1	2 0
	Dispute Resolution (Complaints, due process hearings)		0	0
2. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who primarily receive early intervention services in the home or community-based settings	Monitoring: (Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review/Desk Audit/ On-Site Visit, etc.)	8	0	0
	Dispute Resolution (Complaints, due process hearings)		0	0
3. Percent of infants and toddlers with IFSPs who demonstrate improved outcomes	Monitoring: (Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review/Desk Audit/ On-Site Visit, etc.)	8	0	0
	Dispute Resolution (Complaints, due process hearings)		0	0

Indicator	General Supervision System Components	# of Programs Monitored in FFY 2005	a. # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 (7/1/05-6/30/06)	b. # Findings from a. for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
4. Percent of families participating in Part C who report that early intervention services have helped the family	Monitoring: (Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review/Desk Audit/ On-Site Visit, etc.)	8	0	0
	Dispute Resolution (Complaints, hearings)		0	0
5. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 1 with IFSPs	Monitoring: (Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review/Desk Audit/ On-Site Visit, etc.)	8	0	0
6. Percent of infants and toddlers birth to 3 with IFSPs			0	0
7. Percent of eligible infants and toddlers with IFSPs for whom an evaluation and assessment and an initial IFSP meeting were conducted within Part C's 45-day timeline.	Monitoring: (Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review/Desk Audit/ On-Site Visit, etc.)	8	46 160	46 42
	Dispute Resolution (Complaints, hearings)		0	0
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate	Monitoring: (Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review/Desk Audit/ On-Site Visit, etc.)	8	29	5

Indicator	General Supervision System Components	# of Programs Monitored in FFY 2005	a. # of Findings of noncompliance identified in FFY 2005 (7/1/05-6/30/06)	b. # Findings from a. for which correction was verified no later than one year from identification
community services by their third birthday including: A. IFSPs with transition steps and services;	Dispute Resolution (Complaints, hearings)		0	0
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: B. Notification to LEA, if child potentially eligible for Part B	Monitoring: (Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review/Desk Audit/ On-Site Visit, etc.)	8	0	0
	Dispute Resolution (Complaints, hearings)		0	0
8. Percent of all children exiting Part C who received timely transition planning to support the child's transition to preschool and other appropriate community services by their third birthday including: C. Transition conference, if child potentially eligible for Part B.	Monitoring: (Self-Assessment/ Local APR, Data Review/Desk Audit/ On-Site Visit, etc.)	8	0	0
	Dispute Resolution (Complaints, hearings)		0	0
Sum the numbers down Column a and Column b			200 190	54 47

$\frac{54}{200} \frac{47}{190} \times 100 = \frac{27}{24.7}\%$ of the findings of noncompliance identified between July 1, 2006 and June 30, 2007 were corrected during the same time period.

~~Indicator # 1: Three of the 7 findings of noncompliance were corrected by June 30, 2007. The remaining findings showed improvement, but 100% of the sample cases for each program were not yet in compliance.~~

~~Indicator # 7: Related Requirements monitored through the Case Review Tool that are not assigned to 8.A are assigned to Indicator # 7. 46 of the findings were corrected by June 30, 2007. The~~

~~remaining 118 findings showed improvement, but 100% of the sample cases for each program were not yet in compliance.~~

~~Indicator # 8: Related Requirements monitored through the Case Review Tool concerning transition are assigned to 8.A. Five of the findings were corrected by June 30, 2007. The remaining 24 findings showed improvement, but 100% of the sample cases for each program were not yet in compliance.~~

*ADDED for Clarification 04-14-2008

North Dakota Part C Findings

		Indicator										Total
FFY		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8A	8B	8C	
04/05	# of Progs monitored	8					8		8		8	
	# of New Findings	8						8	1		0	4
	# of Findings Closed in less than 1 yr	0						0	0		0	0
	# of Findings Remaining Open	8						8	1		0	4
05/06	# of Progs monitored	8					8		8		8	
	# of Carry Over Findings	8						8	1		0	4
	# of New Findings	0						0	0		1	0
	# of Findings Closed in less than 1 yr	0						0	0		0	0
	# of Findings Closed after 1 yr	1						2	1		0	2
	# of Findings Remaining Open	7						6	0		1	2
06/07	# of Progs monitored	8					8		8		8	
	# of Carry Over Findings	7						6	0	*	1	2
	# of New Findings	1						0	0	29	0	0
	# of Findings Closed in less than 1 yr	0						0	0	5	0	0
	# of Findings Closed after 1 yr	3						2	0		1	2
	# of Findings Remaining Open	5						4	0	24	0	0

* = Related Requirements attached to Indicator

FFY 04-05

Indicator # 1

Eight findings were made regarding Indicator # 1. All findings remained open at the end of the FFY. The states definition of timely was changed to indicate start date on IFSP.

Indicator # 7

Eight findings were made regarding Indicator # 7. All findings remained open at the end of the FFY.

Indicator # 8

One finding was issued for Indicator # 8A and four findings were issued for Indicator # 8C. All findings remained open at the end of the FFY.

FFY 05-06

Indicator # 1

One finding issued in 04-05 was closed. Seven findings remained open at the end of the FFY. Data collection method was changed to capture the projected start date and actual initiation date of all early intervention service on all IFSPs. Training was provided for IFSP team members.

Indicator # 7

Two findings issued in 04-05 were closed. Six findings remained open at the end of the FFY.

Indicator # 8

One new finding was issued for Indicator # 8B. One finding was closed for Indicator 8A and two findings closed for Indicator 8C. Three findings remained open at the end of the FFY

FFY 06-07

Indicator # 1

One new finding was issued and three findings closed. Five findings remain open for Indicator # 1. One finding is in a program that had only 1 service not initiated by the date on the IFSP. Two findings are for programs that had 2 services not initiated by the IFSP date. One finding is for a program that has 3 services not initiated by the IFSP date. One finding is for a program that had 8 services not initiated by the date on the IFSP. That program must modify their procedures to assure timely delivery of services.

Indicator # 7

Two previously issued findings were closed and four findings remain open for Indicator # 7. All remaining findings are due to hearing screenings not being completed within 45 days. OAEs have been obtained and staff will be trained to conduct the screenings in a timely manner. 160 Related Requirement findings attached to Indicator # 7 were issued. 42 were resolved within a year. 118 Related Requirements remain open. Correction of individual case and systemic noncompliance continues to be monitored for all programs.

Indicator # 8

The three open findings from 05-06 were closed. 29 Related Requirement findings attached to Indicator # 8A were issued. Five of the Related Requirement findings were closed within a year. 24 Related Requirements remain open. Correction of individual case and systemic noncompliance continues to be monitored for all programs.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for (2006)

The following Improvement Activities were modified or added:

3. Develop contract for Family Liaison Project. *02-01-08 - Family Liaison Project not started as a contractor was not located. A contract is now being developed and the timeline has been extended to 07-01-08.

10.A *02-01-08 – University contractors developed recommendations for competency areas and possible implementation strategies. A taskforce of early intervention professionals and families will be formed to operationalize the process and develop an implementation timeline

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006
Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development: See Indicator # 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision

Indicator 10: Percent of signed written complaints with reports issued that were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent = [(1.1(b) + 1.1(c)) divided by 1.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006	100 percent of signed written complaints with reports issued were resolved within 60-day timeline or a timeline extended for exceptional circumstances with respect to a particular complaint.

Actual Target Data for 2006: No signed written complaints were received from 07-01-2006 through 06-30-2007. See completed Dispute Resolutions Table 4.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2006:

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for (2006)
[If applicable]

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development: See Indicator # 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision
--

Indicator 11: Percent of fully adjudicated due process hearing requests that were fully adjudicated within the applicable timeline.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent = [(3.2(a) + 3.2(b)) divided by 3.2] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006	100 percent of due process hearing requests were fully adjudicated within 30 days.

Actual Target Data for 2006: No requests for a due process hearing were received from July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007. See completed Dispute Resolutions Table 4.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2006:

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for (2006)
[If applicable]

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for _2006**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:**

***Not applicable as North Dakota Part C does not utilize Part B due process procedures.

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision
--

Indicator 12: Percent of hearing requests that went to resolution sessions that were resolved through resolution session settlement agreements (applicable if Part B due process procedures are adopted).

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent = (3.1(a) divided by 3.1) times 100.
--

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
(Insert FFY)	(Insert Measurable and Rigorous Target.)

Actual Target Data for (Insert FFY):

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for (Insert FFY):

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for (Insert FFY)
[If applicable]

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for __2006

Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development: See Indicator # 1

Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision
--

Indicator 13: Percent of mediations held that resulted in mediation agreements.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: Percent = [(2.1(a)(i) + 2.1(b)(i)) divided by 2.1] times 100.

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
<i>(Insert FFY)</i>	<i>(Insert Measurable and Rigorous Target.)</i>

Actual Target Data for 2006): No requests for mediations received from July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007.. See completed Dispute Resolutions Table 4.

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for 2006:

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for *(Insert FFY)*
[If applicable]

Part C State Annual Performance Report (APR) for 2006**Overview of the Annual Performance Report Development:** See Indicator # 1**Monitoring Priority: Effective General Supervision Part C / General Supervision****Indicator 14:** State reported data (618 and State Performance Plan and Annual Performance Report) are timely and accurate.

(20 U.S.C. 1416(a)(3)(B) and 1442)

Measurement: State reported data, including 618 data, State performance plan, and annual performance reports, are:

- a. Submitted on or before due dates (February 1 for child count, including race and ethnicity, settings and November 1 for exiting, personnel, dispute resolution); and
- b. Accurate (describe mechanisms for ensuring error free, consistent, valid and reliable data and evidence that these standards are met).

FFY	Measurable and Rigorous Target
2006	100 percent of all required reports will be accurate and submitted on or before due dates.

Actual Target Data for 2006:

SPP/APR Data - Indicator 14				
APR Indicator	Valid and Reliable	Correct Calculation	Followed Instructions	Total
1	1	1	1	3
2	1	1	1	3
3	1	1	1	3
4	1	1	1	3
5	1	1	1	3
6	1	1	1	3
7	1	1	1	3
8a	1	1	1	3
8b	1	1	1	3
8c	1	1	1	3
9	1	1	1	3
10	1	1	1	3
11	1	1	1	3
12	N/A	N/A	N/A	0
13	1	1	1	3

		Subtotal	42
APR Score Calculation	Timely Submission Points - If the FFY2006 APR was submitted on-time, place the number 5 in the cell on the right.		5
	Grand Total - (Sum of subtotal and Timely Submission Points) =		47

618 Data - Indicator 14					
Table	Timely	Complete Data	Passed Edit Check	Responded to Data Note Requests	Total
Table 1 - Child Count Due Date: 2/1/07	1	1	1	1	4
Table 2 - Program Settings Due Date: 2/1/07	1	1	1	1	4
Table 3 - Exiting Due Date: 11/1/07	0	1	1	1	3
Table 4 - Dispute Resolution Due Date: 11/1/07	0	1	1	1	3
				Subtotal	14
618 Score Calculation			Grand Total (Subtotal X 3) =		42

Indicator #14 Calculation	
A. APR Grand Total	47
B. 618 Grand Total	42
C. APR Grand Total (A) + 618 Grand Total (B) =	89
Total NA or N/A in APR	3
Total NA or N/A in 618	0
Base	95
D. Subtotal (C divided by Base*) =	0.937
E. Indicator Score (Subtotal D x 100) =	93.7

Discussion of Improvement Activities Completed and Explanation of Progress or Slippage that occurred for (2006 FFY):

Resources have been added to the state office to support monitoring and reporting requirements. Administrative support staff time equaling .70 FTE and support from DHS Research staff and Informational Technology Services Division staff have been made available to support Part C activities. The Technical Assistance Project contract has been expanded to support monitoring activities.

618 Table 3 and 4 were submitted on time but not received by Westat due to an error in e-mailing. The reports have been resubmitted.

Revisions, with Justification, to Proposed Targets / Improvement Activities / Timelines / Resources for (2006).